

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 6, 2004, the Examiner has issued a restriction requirement, and stated there are two related sub-combinations which are distinct from one another. Specifically, the Examiner states that Group I (claims 1-38) is drawn to a relational database management system, and Group II (claims 39-97) is drawn to creating a multilevel hierarchy and creating a visual display, which constitute patentably distinct sub-combination. Applicants respectfully traverse these statements of the Examiner, as the search for both Group I and Group II would not be any different. However, Applicants provisionally elect to proceed with the claims from Group II (claims 39-97) for prosecution on the merits.

Applicants understand that if the Examiner does not agree with Applicants' position above, then the Examiner will withdraw the claims of Group I (claims 1-38) from further examination pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 09/744,618
Reply to Restriction Requirement
Page 3

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions concerning this Reply or if it will expedite the progress of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/3/04

By: James P. Muraff
James P. Muraff, Reg. No. 39,785
Wallenstein Wagner & Rockey, Ltd.
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630
312.554.3300

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service with first class postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

May 5, 2004
Gillian Gardner
Gillian Gardner/199644

BEST AVAILABLE COPY